



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

with the powers regarding disarmament. Mr. A. C. Bedford, speaking formally as the representative of the American delegation to the International Chamber of Commerce in London, declares his judgment to be that the united opinion of business men the world over is in favor of an agreement to limit armament. The Borah resolution has received the approval of both branches of Congress. Thus, whatever the complications, many of which are known only to the ministries, the great cry of the people for some way out of the dangers where guns face guns is being heard. It is well. It will take brains and good will to calm the storm rising on the Pacific.

BARON SHIDEHARA'S STATEMENT

THERE IS an element of special interest in the statement made to the American people by the Japanese Ambassador, Baron Shidehara, in that the statement *was made to the people*. It was not an unheard-of proceeding—witness President Wilson's appeal to the Italians—but it is sufficiently rare to be worthy of comment, especially since it is a tacit recognition upon the part of a government, generally accounted militaristic, of the present power of public opinion and of the necessity to take into account the masses of the people, who pay the price when statesmen blunder in secret. We suspect that it is an evidence of the growing power of democracy in Nippon.

Other than that, there seems to be no especial merit in the document. The people of the United States do not need information that Great Britain plans no attack upon this country in conjunction with Japan. They are happy to believe that, making allowances for all the differences and conflicts of interest between the two great English-speaking nations, there is still a community of interests and of ideals too deep and too strong to be torn asunder by a pact between Britain and Japan. And, if they did not believe that, they still know it would not be to Great Britain's interest to war with Japan against the United States; and they further know the truth of a statement made by an English publication, quoted elsewhere in this number, that should Great Britain side with Japan against the United States in war, the sure result would be to drive away from the mother country every one of the great self-governing dominions and to wreck the British Empire as we know it today. Hence the people of this country may be excused if they regard as somewhat Pickwickian the grave statement of Baron Shidehara, that "any plan designed to remove the possibility of an armed conflict between the United States and Great Britain was, of course, agreeable to Japan."

Nor will the statement of Baron Shidehara as to Japan's attitude toward China make the Baron's contri-

bution to the general discussion especially valuable to the people of the United States. "Japan," says Baron Shidehara, "sincerely wishes for China an early achievement of peace, unity, and stable government. She desires to cultivate her relations with that country along the path of mutual respect and helpfulness. Her vast commercial interests alone, if for no other consideration, point unmistakably to the wisdom of such a policy." All that, and more, by way of assurance to the American people, historically friendly to China, that renewal of the Anglo-Japanese pact will not work hardship and oppression upon the huge and peaceful nation that is Japan's neighbor. The words are excellent and the American people doubtless were glad to read them; but, it may be assumed very safely, with respect to Japan's relations with China, that the American people would prefer works to the most generous words. Looking forward hopefully to evolution peace-ward, from the concentration of statesmen's minds the world over on the Pacific problem, they will receive cheerfully the message from the distinguished Baron as it deals with China, but they will shrewdly ask for something more tangible than the message. They cannot accept such words at face value while representatives of China and Korea protest in bitter terms to Great Britain's statesmen against Japan's policy in the Far East.

So, appreciative unquestionably of the significance of the Ambassador's direct appeal to American opinion, with its friendly references to relations between the United States and Japan, and its assurance that the Anglo-Japanese pact contemplates no alignment against the United States; appreciative, also, of the significance of the Ambassador's assurance to American opinion of Japan's friendship for China; appreciative of all the direct statements and all the implications of a peaceful purpose in Japan, the people of the United States still will find the principal value of the Shidehara statement in the contribution it makes to the principle of public discussion by diplomats of international problems. It brings nothing concrete to the friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain and it brings nothing concrete to the relief of those Asiatic peoples whom most of America believe to have suffered under an unjust oppression.

OUR FULMINATING ADMIRAL

WE HAVE two objections to Rear-Admiral Sims. We said nothing of his recent outburst in England, for we felt that to be the duty of our government. When Secretary Denby publicly reprimanded this outspoken gentleman, we agreed with the Admiral, that he had "spilt the beans," and with our government, that he

should be publicly reprimanded. It does not appear that the distinguished Rear-Admiral has shown any over-visible signs of repentance, but we would be perfectly willing to overlook that. Our first objection to the gentleman now is that he has broken out again in ill-considered speech, this time in an address before the Rhode Island branch of the Society of the Cincinnati, in which speech he deals imperiously with matters of public policy. In this speech he complains of the failure of the United States "to provide for public criticisms of our officers." The Rear-Admiral will, therefore, not take offense if we criticize him. It ought not to be necessary at this period of our history to point out the impropriety of voluntary and fortuitous interference in matters of our foreign policy by officers of our military service, either army or navy. It is a fundamental American principle that the military arm of our government is subordinate to the will of our civilian population. This is not a matter of mere theory.

At the very first Congress the House of Representatives and the United States Senate agreed to twelve amendments to the United States Constitution, ten of which were ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. These amendments, while appended to the Constitution, have the same force as the original document. The tenth of these amendments provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The meaning of this language is plain. The people of the United States are the source of power.

While our government carries on the legislative, the executive, and the judicial departments in conformity with the Constitution, it is the people who made the Constitution and who set up the government. This is true with reference to our government as a whole; it is true of the military branch of our government in particular. Our military officers have a duty to perform, and a very important duty it is. They are to attend to the creation of an effective military machine for efficient use upon the land or upon the sea when the people in their judgment may see fit to make such use of the instrument which they have, under instructions, provided; but it is not the province of army or navy officers to dictate, directly or indirectly, the policy which the civil population shall adopt and follow.

In the recent war the operations of the draft law were in the hands of the civilian population. The purposes of the nation, the declaration of war, the conduct of the war, were matters under civilian control. The Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, are all civilians. The American people object to dictation in matters of policy

from their generals and admirals, not for personal reasons, but as a matter of vital principle.

Admiral Sims, in the address to which we refer, taking General Washington as his point of departure, complains bitterly of the American people for their dangerous lack of a proper solicitude as to our national security. He calls this a "national defect"; and yet, later in the same speech, he reveals the insignificance of his words when he says: "America has never been defeated in war and suffered humiliation or loss of territory. Our independence has never been in danger." The Admiral is right. We in America are in a condition of "preparedness" which the Admiral seems to know not of. That preparedness is in the realm of ideas, of successful accomplishment in material and spiritual directions. As with Sir Galahad, so with our nation: its strength is in proportion to its purity of heart. It is strange that our military men who break excitedly into public utterance seem never capable of understanding that true preparedness is a matter of policy. Rear-Admiral Sims has gone back not to Washington for his guide, but to Frederick the Great and William of Hohenzollern. But our chief objection to these outbursts from the virile Admiral is based upon the fact that he forgets the limitations of his profession and concerns himself feverishly with reference to matters outside his legitimate field.

But we have another objection to our doughty Admiral. For the purposes of his propaganda, he has wittingly or unwittingly misinterpreted, wholly misinterpreted, the teachings of George Washington. Throughout his speech he quotes from Washington to bolster his argument that "the missing element in Americanism is that it does not include adequate solicitude for our safety. . . . The consequence is that the American people know less about the elements of warfare and less about the actual condition of their military forces than the people of any of the other great powers." The Admiral gains nothing by this misrepresentation of the Father of our Country. It is inexplicable that he should ignore those words in Washington's farewell address, to wit: "Overgrown military establishments are, under any form of government, inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty." Surely the Admiral must have read Mr. Washington's letter to David Humphreys, Secretary of the commission sent abroad to negotiate treaties of commerce—a letter which he wrote under date of July 25, 1785, and in which he said: "My first wish is to see this plague to mankind (war) banished from the earth, and the sons and daughters of this world employed in more pleasing and innocent amusements than in preparing implements and exercising them for the destruction of mankind."

We are willing to grant that Rear-Admiral William S.

Sims is a very great admiral, that he is scientifically proficient in his field, that he knows ships and their maneuvers, guns and their operation, sailors and their behavior, navies and their control. He is paid to know these things. If we need him in his field we expect him to serve in the future, as in the past, with intelligence and gallantry. We are convinced, however, that he should cease his fulminations on matters of policy, particularly foreign policy; and we have confidence enough in the integrity of the gentleman to believe that when once he familiarizes himself with the life and teachings of George Washington he will not misrepresent that great American, even when under the influence of a gnawing temptation to enlarge his arm of our common service.

AN IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

THE FIRST IMPERIAL CONFERENCE since the war was opened in London, Monday, June 20. Here surely was an important group. The Conference included Mr. Lloyd-George, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom; Mr. Arthur Meighen, Prime Minister of Canada; Mr. W. M. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia; Mr. W. F. Massey, Prime Minister of New Zealand; General Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, and Mr. Montagu, the Maharaja of Cutch. The others present at the Conference were Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Winston Churchill, of the United Kingdom; Sir Thomas Smartt, Minister of Agriculture; Colonel H. Mentz, Minister of Defense of South Africa, and Mr. Srinivasi-Sastri, of India. We have no doubt that the results of their conversations will be important not only to the future of the British Empire, but to the other nations of the world.

Utterances within this council, such as we have been able to gather, are of interest and, in the main, of encouragement. Mr. Lloyd-George seems to have been at his best. "Unless treaty faith is maintained," he said, "an era of disorganization, increasing misery, and smouldering war will continue and civilization may very easily be destroyed by a prolongation of that state of things." Calling attention to the nerve exhaustion and heart strain, the feverish restlessness and the disinclination to steady labor, he went on to say, "There is a widening and deepening conviction that the world must have peace, if it is ever to recover health." It is true that Mr. Lloyd-George believes in at least one kind of disarmament, namely, the disarmament of Germany. He also granted that there is no quarter of the world where he desires more greatly to maintain peace and fair play for all nations and to avoid a competition of armaments than in the Pacific and in the Far East.

And he said, further, "Our foreign policy can never range itself in any sense upon the differences of race and civilization between East and West. It would be fatal to the Empire." Going on, he added: "We desire to work with the great Republic [the United States] in all parts of the world. Like it, we want stability and peace, on the basis of liberty and justice. Like it, we desire to avoid the growth of armaments, whether in the Pacific or elsewhere, and we rejoice that American opinion should be showing so much earnestness in that direction at the present time." And then, true to his English tradition, it would seem that he proceeded to cancel all his remarks looking toward any disarmament by saying, "In the meantime we cannot forget that the very life of the United Kingdom, as also of Australia and New Zealand—indeed the whole Empire—has been built upon sea power, and that sea power is necessarily the basis of the whole Empire's existence. We have, therefore, to look to the measures which our security requires; we aim at nothing more; we cannot possibly be content with less." And since Japan is also relying upon sea power, and the United States withal, it would seem that the movement for a practical reduction of armaments is in for some trouble. When, however, this dynamic Welshman grants that while there was a time when Downing Street controlled the Empire, today the Empire is in charge of Downing Street, he perhaps unwittingly encouraged the workers for disarmament after all. There was another interesting passage in this address, of significance to us Americans who are prone to emphasize the significance of our federal organization as something of a model for the future organization of the world. He said, "The British Empire is a saving fact in a very distracted world. It is the most hopeful experiment in human organization which the world has yet seen. It is based not on force, but on good will and a common understanding. Liberty is its binding principle. Where that principle has not hitherto been applied it is gradually being introduced into the structure. It is our duty here to present the ideals of this great association of peoples in willing loyalty to one sovereign, to take counsel together with the progress and welfare of all, and to keep our strength, both moral and material, a united power for justice, liberty, and peace." It serves no purpose to find fault with Mr. George because of his superlative phraseology, just as it serves no purpose for us to insist that our own organization of forty-eight free, sovereign, and independent States on this hemisphere is the most perfect this or the most perfect that. The simple fact is that they are both excellent and most highly suggestive, these two ventures in international organization. The evolution of the British Empire is on the way. It is a great fact of current history, as it